

# SENATE RECORD VOTE ANALYSIS

105th Congress  
1st Session

Vote No. 78

May 21, 1997, 9:43 pm  
Page S-4868 Temp. Record

## BUDGET RESOLUTION/NIH Funding

**SUBJECT:** Senate Concurrent Budget Resolution for fiscal years 1998-2002 . . . S.Con. Res. 27. Mack amendment No. 315.

### ACTION: AMENDMENT AGREED TO, 98-0

**SYNOPSIS:** As reported, S. Con Res. 27, the Concurrent Budget Resolution for fiscal year 1998, will balance the Federal budget in fiscal year (FY) 2002 by slowing the overall rate of growth in spending over the next 5 years to below the rate of growth in revenue collections (the Congressional Budget Office recently revised upwards its 5-year revenue estimate by \$225 billion).

**The Mack amendment** would express the sense of the Senate that this resolution assumes that appropriations for the National Institutes of Health (NIH) will be increased by 100 percent over the next 5 fiscal years (FYs), and will be increased by \$2 billion in FY 1998 from the amount appropriated in FY 1997. The amendment is based on numerous findings that identify areas where further biomedical research is needed, that list NIH biomedical research results that have saved lives and reduced health care costs, and that conclude that NIH is very underfunded.

**Those favoring** the amendment contended:

Advances in medical treatments in recent decades have been breathtaking. Diseases that were once untreatable now have high cure rates. For instance, the cure rate for leukemia is up to 60 percent. As fast as these advances have come, much more can be done. The medical information is building on itself exponentially, with each new gain leading the way for many more treatments and pointing to new areas that need to be studied. The only break on this activity has been a lack of funding. Though the NIH has done better than most Federal programs, funding has not kept pace with the increasing need. In fact, despite the yearly large increases, we have actually slipped a little in the funding of worthwhile biomedical research projects. Today, only 28 percent of approved NIH grant applications are funded, which is down from 30 percent in 1992. This failure to provide funding is tragic. Every Senator, and

(See other side)

YEAS (98)				NAYS (0)		NOT VOTING (2)	
Republican (53 or 100%)		Democrats (45 or 100%)		Republicans (0 or 0%)	Democrats (0 or 0%)	Republicans (2)	Democrats (0)
Abraham	Hutchison	Akaka	Johnson			Gregg- <sup>2</sup> Helms- <sup>2AY</sup>	
Allard	Inhofe	Baucus	Kennedy				
Ashcroft	Jeffords	Biden	Kerrey				
Bennett	Kempthorne	Bingaman	Kerry				
Bond	Kyl	Boxer	Kohl				
Brownback	Lott	Breaux	Landrieu				
Burns	Lugar	Bryan	Lautenberg				
Campbell	Mack	Bumpers	Leahy				
Chafee	McCain	Byrd	Levin				
Coats	McConnell	Cleland	Lieberman				
Cochran	Murkowski	Conrad	Mikulski				
Collins	Nickles	Daschle	Moseley-Braun				
Coverdell	Roberts	Dodd	Moynihan				
Craig	Roth	Dorgan	Murray				
D'Amato	Santorum	Durbin	Reed				
DeWine	Sessions	Feingold	Reid				
Domenici	Shelby	Feinstein	Robb				
Enzi	Smith, Bob	Ford	Rockefeller				
Faircloth	Smith, Gordon	Glenn	Sarbanes				
Frist	Snowe	Graham	Torricelli				
Gorton	Specter	Harkin	Wellstone				
Gramm	Stevens	Hollings	Wyden				
Grams	Thomas	Inouye					
Grassley	Thompson						
Hagel	Thurmond						
Hatch	Warner						
Hutchinson							

#### EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

- 1—Official Business
- 2—Necessarily Absent
- 3—Illness
- 4—Other

#### SYMBOLS:

- AY—Announced Yea
- AN—Announced Nay
- PY—Paired Yea
- PN—Paired Nay

everyone in America, has lost loved ones to diseases like cancer or AIDS. If more funding were provided, cures could be developed more quickly. Few scientists doubt that it is little more than a matter of time before we come up with effective treatments for those deadly diseases as well as for mental disorders, arthritis, Parkinson's disease, and other ailments. We are tantalizingly close to finding treatments, but if we provide inadequate funding it will take longer to succeed, and people will needlessly suffer and die in the meantime. If funding were doubled as proposed by this amendment, the benefits would be huge. For instance, 20 percent of all cancer patients in the United States could be involved in clinical NIH studies instead of the current 2 percent. The benefits in financial terms would be just as great. For instance, more than \$50 billion annually could be saved if doctors found a way to delay the onset of Alzheimer's by 5 years. Though Senators may have their disagreements on the appropriate size and roles of Government, there is little disagreement on the value of and need for more medical research. We therefore strongly urge our colleagues to vote in favor of the Mack amendment.

**While favoring the amendment,** some Senators expressed the following reservations:

Throughout our Senate service we have argued for greater medical research funding. Over the years, we have managed to gain greater funding, even as other Federal spending has been cut. As our colleagues have correctly noted, though, the need for more research has still outstripped the funding increases. With that said, we note that the function in this budget resolution from which the NIH is funded is slightly below a funding freeze level. Thus, if this resolution really assumes that \$2 billion more will be spent on NIH this year, than it also assumes that other areas funded under that function, like the Low Income Home Energy Assistance (LIHEAP) program are going to be cut by that amount. We certainly do not favor such cuts. It is our intention to try to get an across-the-board cut in other domestic discretionary spending to pay for increased NIH funding instead. With that caveat, we are pleased to vote in favor of the Mack amendment.

**No arguments were expressed in opposition to the amendment.**